DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 834 HE 001 121

Review of Procedures to be Used in CCHE Annual Study of Faculty Salaries and Benefits.
California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento.
Report No-CCHE-69-6
Pub Date 6 May 69
Note-53p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.75
Descriptors-*Faculty, Fringe Benefits, *Higher Education, *Legislation, Policy Formation, *Salaries, *State Aid
Identifiers-*California

Since 1962, the Coordinating Council has annually developed recommendations for the legislature and governor of California on faculty salary increases and other benefits at the University of California and the California state colleges. Because the Council and other agencies had expressed concern about various aspects of the procedures used in composing the report, the Council's staff was instructed to examine these procedures and make recommendations for changes. This document represents the results of the examination. Proposed revisions were designed to overcome major difficulties in: the timing of the report: the institutions used for comparison purposes: and calculating procedures leading to the formulation of staff recommendations to the Council. Each of the changes is discussed in Chapters 1, 2 and 3. Tables accompany the text. The Council adopted the revised procedures on July 15, 1969. (JS)

EDO 32834

COORDINATING

CALIFORNIA'S

HIGHER

EDUCATION

REVIEW OF PROCEDURES TO BE USED IN CCHE ANNUAL STUDY OF FACULTY SALARIES AND BENEFITS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COORDINATING

COUNCIL for

HIGHER

EDUCATION

69 - 9

FOR PRESENTATION TO THE COUNCIL

May 5, 1969

#324

COORDINATING COUNCIL
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Resolution on Procedures for Faculty Salary Study

WHEREAS, The Council requested its staff to examine the procedures used in developing staff recommendations on faculty salaries and benefits at the University of California and the California State Colleges and to report its recommendations at the May 1969 meeting of the Council, and

WHEREAS, The Council's staff has developed a report (CCHE #69-6) proposing revisions in the procedures which will overcome the major difficulties associated with existing procedures within the time constraints that exist; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Coordinating Council for Higher Education accepts and approves the report, Review of Procedures to be Used in CCHE Annual Study of Faculty Salaries and Benefits (CCHE Report No. 69-6), and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Council's staff shall adopt and use the revised procedures in its 1969 report to the Council on faculty salaries and benefits at the University and the State Colleges.

Adopted
July 15, 1969

Coordinating Council
for Higher Education

SUMMARY OF
REVIEW OF PROCEDURES TO BE USED
IN CCHE ANNUAL STUDY OF FACULTY SALARIES AND BENEFITS

Since 1962, the Council has annually developed recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor on faculty salary increases for the University and the State Colleges.

These reports have been developed through procedures which are an integral part of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51, 1965 General Session. The Council, Council staff, the segments, and other agencies have expressed concern about various aspects of present procedures through which the report is developed. At the December 1968 meeting of the Council the staff was requested to examine these procedures and report its recommendations at the May 1969 meeting of the Council. Report 69-6 presents the results of this examination.

The report addresses itself to three major difficulties associated with present methods and proposes revisions in the procedures which will overcome these difficulties. The major difficulties discussed are:

1. Timing of the report.

2. Institutions used for comparison purposes.

3. Calculating procedures.

The proposed revisions in the procedure are:

1. The use of 19 institutions as comparison institutions for compensation purposes for the University of California. They are: the Ivy League institutions (minus Dartmouth) plus the Big Ten institutions plus the University of Chicago and Stanford University.

2. The use of 102 institutions as comparison institutions for compensation purposes for the California State Colleges. They are: the major public universities within each of the 50 states, 20 other public universities who satisfy the university definitional requirements of AAUP and 32 private institutions classified as universities by AAUP.

3. The source of compensation data for the comparison institutions will be the annual publication of AAUP entitled, The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession. The use of this source of data will allow the Council's staff to prepare the annual report on salaries and benefits well ahead of the legislative deadline of December 1.

4. The personnel for which salary and fringe benefit data are to be reported by the California segments are defined in the report.

5. The use of AAUP data will require two-year projections of average salaries and compensation at each of the comparison institutions.

6. The median of the projected average salaries at the comparison institutions will provide the basis for salary recommendations. In respect to the California State Colleges, the percentile to be used will be either the median or a higher percentile to be determined subsequent to the Council's determination of the amount of money required to restructure the salary scales currently used for faculty in the California State Colleges.

7. The median of the projected dollar equivalents of countable fringe benefits at the comparison institutions (including data from only those institutions having retirement programs that vest within five years) will provide the basis for countable fringe benefits recommendations.

8. The Council staff will sample the groups of comparison institutions in order to determine the accuracy of the first year of the two-year projections.

REVIEW OF PROCEDURES TO BE USED IN COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ANNUAL STUDY OF FACULTY SALARIES AND BENEFITS

Report No. 69-6

Coordinating Council for Higher Education
1020 Twelfth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

May 6, 1969

PREFACE

Since 1962, the Council has annually developed recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor on faculty salary increases for the University and the State Colleges.

These reports have been developed through procedures which are an integral part of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51, 1965 General Session. The Council, Council staff, the segments, and other agencies have expressed concern about various aspects of present procedures through which the report is developed. At the December 1968 meeting of the Council the staff was requested to examine these procedures and report its recommendations at the May 1969 meeting of the Council. This report is the result of this examination.

The report addresses itself to three major difficulties associated with present methods and proposes revisions in the procedures which will overcome these difficulties. The major difficulties discussed are:

1. Timing of the report.

2. Institutions used for comparison purposes.

3. Calculating procedures.

This staff report has been prepared by Dr. Russell L. Riese under the general direction of Dr. Willard B. Spalding.

OWEN ALBERT KNORR
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		i
CHAPTER I	- TIMING OF THE REPORT	
	Salary Data	I-2
CHAPTER II	- THE SELECTION OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR COMPARISON PURPOSES	
	Selection of Comparison Institutions	II-1
	University of California	II-3
	The Comparison Eight	II-5
	Members of the Association of American Universities	II-5
	The Comparison 19	II-7
	California State Colleges	II-9
	Public and Private Universities	II-13
CHAPTER III	- CALCULATING PROCEDURES	
	Use of AAUP Data	III-1
	Advantages of Using AAUP Data	III-1
	Disadvantages in Using AAUP Data	III-2
	Weighting of Faculty Data	III-4
	Adjusting to the Staffing Pattern of the California Segment	III-4
	Countable Fringe Benefits	III-7
	Salary and Fringe Benefits Data to be Reported to Council Staff by the California Segments	III-9
CHAPTER IV	- SUMMARY (A Revised Procedure for Reporting on Faculty Salaries)	
APPENDIX	- HISTORICAL USE OF COMPARISON INSTITUTIONS	

INTRODUCTION

Since 1962 the Council has annually developed recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor on the need for faculty salary increases for the State Colleges and the University. In early years, data on the studies were collected by questionnaire by the segments. Beginning in 1967 Council staff along with State College representatives made joint visits to the State College comparison institutions to collect data. In 1968 this process was continued and Council staff members accompanied both University and State College personnel to campuses of their respective comparison institutions for the purpose of the Council's 1969-70 annual report. From these experiences and knowledge gained, the staff has from time to time called to the attention of the Council, the segments, and other agencies several difficulties in existing procedures.[1]

Several members of the Council exhibited concern when the 1969-70 report was presented at the December (1968) meeting of the Council. The staff report, developed in accord with legislative direction, indicated a salary increase of 10.2 percent for the State Colleges to maintain comparability. However, the Council after considerable debate reduced the proposed recommendation to 5.2 percent--the same percentage increase recommended for the University based on its comparison institutions. At the same time, the Council recommended that "the staff examine the procedures used by the Council in considering salary matters at the University of California and the California State Colleges and report its recommendations at the May 1969 meeting of the Council."

The Legislative Analyst in his analysis of the Governor's proposed budget for 1969-70 noted that the 1968 report was prepared in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 General Session and that the comparison institutions used in the report were the same as those used in the 1967 report.[2]

In supporting the Council's salary recommendations the Analyst concluded that the State Colleges are being compared to the wrong institutions.[3] As a result he recommended that the State Colleges' list of comparison institutions used for salary and other justification purposes be critically evaluated and revised by the Coordinating Council

---

[1]These procedures were not developed by the Council staff. They are an integral part of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51, 1965 General Session which requested the Council, in cooperation with the University of California and the California State Colleges, to submit annually to the Governor and the Legislature a faculty salary and welfare report containing the basic information recommended in the report of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. The report of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee which was prepared by the Legislative Analyst was based on information presented in public hearings in connection with HR 250 by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the University of California, the California State Colleges, the Department of Finance, and various faculty organizations.

[2]Analysis of the Budget Bill, Fiscal year July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970. A Report of the Legislative Analyst to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, p. 860.

[3]Ibid. p. 339.

for Higher Education to more properly reflect institutions assigned the same functions as the colleges.[1] He also noted the distorting influence in the calculating method used to determine comparability through adjusting salaries at each rank in the comparison institutions to the State College staffing pattern.[2]

In addition to the concerns mentioned above, the Council staff and the segmental staffs agree that any changes in the development of the annual report should address themselves to another serious problem: the matter of timing of the report.

SCR 51 requires the Coordinating Council for Higher Education to submit annually to the Governor and the Legislature not later than December 1, a faculty salary and welfare benefits report. Since it is necessary for staff of the executive and legislative branches of government to analyze recommendations prior to submission of the Governor's budget for legislative consideration, this reporting date cannot be changed to a later time.

The 1969 meeting schedule adopted by the Council will require the Council to consider the report at its October 6-7 meeting. Mailing of the report to Council members should be no later than September 22 with production of the report scheduled no later than September 15. Data from the segments and the comparison institutions will need to be available to Council staff no later than September 8. Institutions selected as comparison institutions do not generally have these data available before late November or December--after the report is prepared and in some cases after the Council has adopted its recommendations.

From this brief introduction, it can be seen that three major concerns have been expressed by various persons or agencies and the Council and its staff over the Council's annual report on faculty salaries and welfare benefits:

1. Timing of the Report
2. Institutions Used for Comparison Purposes
3. Calculating Procedures

Each of these questions is treated in the following chapters of this report. A procedure is proposed to overcome each of the above concerns; although the revised procedure is not necessarily considered to be the best approach, it is considered to be a decided improvement over the current procedure within the time constraints that exist.

---

[1] Ibid. p. 864

[2] Ibid. p. 338

Chapter I

TIMING OF THE REPORT

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 requires the Council to submit its annual report on faculty salaries and welfare benefits not later than December 1.[1] There is little leeway for reporting on a later date because the Council's recommendations must be available at the time the Governor's budget is being prepared. In order for the Council to submit its recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature not later than December 1, the staff report must be presented to the Council in October or November and data for the report, in turn, must be collected before mid-September or mid-October. Many institutions can supply only estimated data for the current academic year at this early date. These estimates are in terms of adjusted budget data or data for the previous year adjusted by an average percentage increase approved by their respective legislative bodies and/or governing boards. Furthermore, at this early date, most institutions cannot accurately report the number of faculty at each rank for the current year. Nevertheless they have been extremely cooperative in attempting to meet California's deadlines.

To illustrate the problem created by the timing of the report, the Council staff last spring wrote each of the State College comparison institutions requesting the earliest date when faculty and faculty salary data would be available. While some institutions indicated a September or October date, others indicated the data would not be available until their November 1 payrolls were processed, suggesting approximately November 15 and in one case a date of December 15.

The University Regents, upon recommendation of the President, generally approve a range for recommended average salary increase at their late November meeting with "the specific percent dependent upon confirmation of information from comparative institutions."[2] This action occurs at a time when the Council report has been completed and mailed. On most occasions the timing requirement has led to a difference between the Council's and Regent's recommendations for the University, which have caused confusion in the Legislature and creates doubt as to the veracity of the Council's recommendations.

This happens to be the case again this year. At the January 16, 1969, meeting of the Board of Regents, the Board was reminded that the

---

[1] SCR 51 states, "Resolved, by the Senate of the State of California, the Assembly thereof concurring, That the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in cooperation with the University of California and the California State Colleges shall submit annually to the Governor and the Legislature not later than December 1 a faculty salary and welfare benefits report containing the basic information recommended in the report of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee as filed with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the Assembly, under date of March 22, 1965."

[2] From the agenda of the Committee on Educational Policy of the Board of Regents for meeting of November 21, 1968.

November 1968 report submitted to them was preliminary and it was based in part on estimated salary data for 1968-69 for the comparison institutions. The Regents, in turn, approved a revised report based on actual salary data which supports an increase in the University's all-ranks faculty salary (excluding schools of medicine, dentistry and law) of 5.31%. (Data supplied to Council staff by the University supported a recommended increase of 5.2% which the Council adopted as its recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature.)

The timing of the report not only complicates the collection of data from the comparison institutions, but from the California segments as well. For example, when the University first submitted its 1968 data on October 18, the covering letter stated, "In addition, the University of California faculty salary data presented are also estimates: final information on University salaries by rank, including the .6% special salary supplementation money, will not be available until after November 1, 1968." The University's faculty salary information was received by the Council staff on November 4, 1968.

Reporting for the State Colleges is further complicated by the sequence of recommendations they wish to receive. After receipt of the necessary data from their comparison institutions, the Trustees and the Chancellor prefer to have the Chancellor's Office staff recommendations go to the Statewide Academic Senate for consideration. These recommendations are then presented to the Board of Trustees and the Trustees in turn transmitting their recommendations to the Council. In order for the State Colleges to comply with the Council's deadline for submission of data which provides compliance with SCR 51 and to follow their desired sequential pattern of considerations, the State Colleges need the necessary data in early September or October--generally at a date well before they are available.

Salary Data

The early date at which data are needed in order for the Council staff to develop proposed recommendations for Council consideration has led to some questions about the accuracy of the data. As cited earlier, the Council staff must have data available from each of the comparison institutions and the University and the State Colleges by mid-October. In some cases the data are estimated--not only for certain individual comparison institutions but for the California segments as well.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) collects and publishes data on average salary and compensation each year for institutions of higher education. These data are normally collected during the month of December. While the University has consistently questioned the data contained in the AAUP report, several comparison institutions maintain that their report to AAUP is more accurate than the data collected early in the academic year and provided to Council and segmental staff. Some institutions commented that the AAUP data are gathered at a time when compensation and numbers of faculty in any given academic year are well stabilized and therefore more realistically portray their situation.

Data acquired by the Council and the segments in fall 1967 for the 1967 faculty report were compared with data published by AAUP for the same year and acquired in December 1967. This is shown in Table I-1 and Table I-2. The tabulation also includes University and State College data reported to the Council and to AAUP.

TABLE I-1

AVERAGE FACULTY SALARY DATA
1967
State Colleges and Their Comparison Institutions

Institution	Reported to CCHE Fall 1967	Reported to AAUP December 1967	Difference
A	$14,611	$14,838	$+227
B	14,099	13,406	-693
C	14,022	13,195	-827
D	13,442	13,959	+517
E	12,508	12,429	- 79
F	12,421	12,320	-101
G	12,356	12,378	+ 22
H	12,340	12,309	- 31
I	12,308	12,079	-229
J	12,259	12,291	+ 32
K	12,212	12,331	+119
L	11,865	11,965	+100
M	11,800	11,974	+174
N	11,639	12,589	+950
O	11,619	11,983	+364
P	11,464	11,252	-212
Q	11,209	11,047	-162
R	11,136	11,162	+ 26
CSC	$11,850	$11,850	$ 0

TABLE I-2

AVERAGE FACULTY SALARY DATA
1967
University of California and its Comparison Institutions

Institution	Reported to CCHE Fall 1967	Reported to AAUP December 1967	Difference
A	$12,199	$12,177	$- 22
B	13,841	13,682	-159
C	15,120	15,387	+267
D	12,212	12,541	+329
E	13,791	13,855	+ 64
F	13,961	14,276	+315
G	15,701	16,200	+499
H	13,503	13,017	-486
U.C.	$12,892	$13,142	$+150

Chapter II

THE SELECTION OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR COMPARISON PURPOSES

The concept of comparison institutions and their use as bases for salary recommendations implements the principle of comparability. This policy has been enunciated by the state on several occasions for all its employees, with particular reference to faculty in the State Colleges.[1] The University has adhered to the principle since 1920. Similarly, since 1940 the State Colleges have based their recommendations on various groups of comparison institutions.

Within the context of the faculty salary report, the term "comparison institutions" merely means groups of selected institutions with which the University of California and the California State Colleges, respectively, compare average salaries and fringe benefits.

The historical use of comparison institutions is presented in the Appendix.

Selection of Comparison Institutions

The selection of comparison institutions for each of the California segments is an onerous but important task. Through the process of selecting institutions to be used for comparison of compensation, one is essentially determining the amount of money the state should pay for higher education and determining the quality of its higher education.

A readily available and extensive source of data on faculty salaries and compensation is published annually by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) under the title, "The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession." In the summer 1966 issue of the bulletin, AAUP reminded the readers of their report that,

> . . . even in a period of relatively prosperity one must be sensitive to the fact that not all institutions have shared equally in the escalating incomes of higher education and that some institutions still have salary levels so low that the reader may find them hard to believe.[2]

---

[1] Government Code, Section 18850 (which applies to State Civil Service); Education Code, Section 22607 (which applies to the California State Colleges); House Resolution 250 (1964 First Extraordinary Session) Appendix 1; and Statement of Findings and Recommendations on State College and University Faculty Salaries, report transmitted by the Subcommittee to Honorable Wallace D. Henderson, Member, California State Assembly, May 21, 1957, p. 2. The Subcommittee included the Director of Finance, Legislative Analyst, Executive Office of the State Personnel Board, and representatives of the University and the State Colleges.

[2] AAUP Bulletin, Summer 1966, pp. 142-143.

An example of the wide variation in faculty compensation can be drawn from the listing of institutions and their respective full-time faculty compensation. In 1967, average faculty compensation at one institution was only $7,300, whereas the institution with the highest compensation had an average in excess of $19,000--a ratio of approximately 2½ : 1. Further, AAUP reports that the salaries of professors at public universities average $2,110 less than the salaries of private independent universities. On a total compensation basis, differences are even greater.

Average compensation for professors at public universities in 1967 was $17,481 as compared to $20,762 in private independent universities. At the Associate Professor level the figures are $12,033 and $14,193; at the Assistant Professor level $10,813 and $11,316; at the Instructor level $8,219 and $8,594.

The report indicates that Professors' salaries at public universities are approximately $1,700 higher than Professors' salaries at public liberal arts colleges.

Salaries in public liberal arts colleges are slightly higher at all ranks than at private liberal arts colleges.

Of the first 22 institutions listed by the AAUP in descending order of average compensation, one is public and it was 11th.

Of the first 31 institutions listed in descending order of average compensation, 4 were public institutions, 2 are church-related and 1 institution is operated by the federal government.

A list of institutions arranged in descending order with highest faculty compensations per full-time student-equivalent draws attention because none of the institutions is public.

Although these facts about salaries at certain private institutions can be observed from data contained in the report, the AAUP Bulletin for Summer 1968 calls attention to the massive financial crisis that threatens the private sector of the nation's institutions of higher education. These relationships are cited only to acquaint the reader with the wide variations in faculty renumeration among institutions.

In the past the Council staff prepared detailed plans for each study. These study plans were submitted to the Council for discussion as information items. Such was the case when on May 22, 1967, the Council received and commented on the plan for the 1967 Report of Faculty Recruitment, Salaries and Benefits. The emphasis of the staff Plan was centered around identifying those institutions with which the California segments compete for faculty. With reference to expanding the number of institutions used as comparison institutions for the University the Plan stated, "All additional comparison institutions will be those with functions similar to those of the University as well as those with which the University competes for faculty." With reference to the State Colleges the Plan stated, "In this year's report the comparison institutions for the California State Colleges will be re-examined with a view toward enlarging the sample as well as adding institutions with which the State Colleges compete for faculty." Speaking about

comparison institutions in general the Plan stated, "Institutions selected for a study of consistency [consistency of salaries and salary relationships] should be those institutions offering competition for faculty members who have acceptable qualifications."

Further, the Plan proposed a study of faculty mobility in order to identify competition of faculty. The Plan stated, "At the outset the segments will be asked to make an intensive study of sources of supply of faculty and loss of faculty. In other words, what are sources of faculty for each segment? Further, when people leave each segment where do they go? Answers to these questions will assist in future identification of the competing institutions with which we must be externally consistent." The intent of the study of faculty mobility was not only to identify competing institutions but also to examine the whole matter of recruitment and retention with particular emphasis on job satisfactions.

The study of faculty mobility was not undertaken; however, the segments, particularly the University, have collected a great deal of information which has served as background for the (University) President's Annual Academic Personnel Report.

Three criteria should be kept in mind when selecting groups of comparison institutions: (1) data must be readily available, (2) a large number of institutions is desirable, and (3) the respective lists of comparison institutions should reflect a major portion of the faculty market in which the particular segment competes.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Council staff and the segments are continually confronted with questions relating to the similarity of programs, numbers of doctoral candidates, research funds, private or public support, and other aspects related to similarity of institutions. It may be possible to develop a list of comparable institutions for individual campuses of the University, particularly the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses, that have many similarities; for example, the "Big 5" institutions. However, other campuses of the University are new and have recently been designated as general campuses. For these campuses similar institutions are more difficult to identify.

The Education Directory published by the U.S. Office of Education classes institutions by highest level of offering and by type of program. All University campuses are classified under the joint designation of IVk.

Highest Level of Training[1]

The following categories have been established to designate institutions by highest level of training:

I. 2 but less than 4 years of work beyond the 12th grade--includes junior colleges, technical institutes, and normal schools offering at least a 2-year program of college-level studies;

---

[1]U. S. Office of Education, Education Directory, 1966-67, Part 3. Higher Education 1967, p. 1.

II. Only the bachelor's and/or first professional degree--includes those institutions offering courses of studies leading to the customary bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree, and all those degrees which entitled the possessor to enter the profession indicated; e.g., doctor of medicine, bachelor of pharmacy, or bachelor of science in engineering;

III. Master's and/or second professional degree--includes those institutions offering the customary first graduate degree, and any degree earned in the same field after the first professional degree, or after a bachelor's degree in that field; e.g., the degree of electrical engineering, earned after the bachelor of engineering, or the degree of master of sacred theology earned after the bachelor of divinity degree;

IV. Doctor of Philosophy and equivalent degrees; and

V. Other

Type of Program[1]

The designations of institutions by type of program are as follows:

a. Terminal-occupational (below bachelor's degree)--to represent a program not extending beyond the 14th or 15th grade, designed to prepare directly for an occupation, and not intended to prepare for advanced study;
b. Liberal arts and general--including those institutions offering a 4-year program leading to the bachelor's degree;
c. Liberal arts and general, and terminal-occupational--for institutions offering programs described by a and b above;
d. Primarily teacher preparatory;
e. Liberal arts and general, and teacher preparatory;
f. Liberal arts and general, teacher preparatory, and terminal-occupational;
g. Professional only (not including teacher preparatory);
h. Professional and teacher preparatory;
i. Professional and terminal-occupational;
j. Liberal arts and general with 1 or 2 professional schools; and
k. Liberal arts and general with 3 or more professional schools--including institutions organized as universities.

The Directory lists 145 institutions in the same classification (the same level and type of program) as the University. Which institutions from the list should be selected then as comparison institutions for the University of California?

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

The Comparison Eight

Although the University for many years had used five "eminent" universities for salary comparison purposes, objections were raised in 1967 to the use of only five comparison institutions (Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, Yale & Princeton) and to the use of a high portion of heavily endowed private institutions. Three of the special group of five universities represented institutions ranking first, second, and fourth in size of endowment funds.

In order to provide a list of comparison institutions balanced between private and public institutions, the Council used for the 1968 report an expanded list of eight institutions. They were: Cornell, Harvard, Illinois, Michigan, Stanford, SUNY-Buffalo, Wisconsin, and Yale.

This list appears to have satisfied those who had previously expressed their concerns. However, it would be desirable to expand the list beyond eight institutions in order to reduce the pronounced effect that extreme variations at one institution cause on the whole.

Members of the Association of American Universities

The (University) President's Academic Personnel Report presented to The Regents on January 16, 1969, describes the nature and the extent of the particular market in which the University competes for faculty members. The report states, "the particular market in which the University of California competes for faculty members, however, is probably better identified by examining the flow of tenured staff (Professor and Associate Professor), rather than of all faculty members. Appointment with immediate tenure is offered to a highly valued scholar recruited from other employment, rather than directly from student status."[1]

The Report contains the following table.

Table II-1[2]

	Other Universities and Colleges	Government	Industry and Private Practice	Independent Research and Service Agencies
To U.C. from	78%	8%	10%	4%
From U.C. to	80	5	12	3

Table II-1 clearly demonstrates that the University's competition for faculty members is largely with other institutions of higher education. Government, industry and private practice, and independent research and service organizations individually comprise minor sources of faculty.

---

[1] "Annual Report on Personnel Program" University of California, December, 1968. p. 5.

[2] Ibid., p. 5

Another table in the same report shows the distribution of flow of tenured faculty members to and from the campuses of the University since July 1, 1960.

Table II-2[1]

	9 Ranking[2] Universities	31 Other AAU Members	All Other American Universities and Colleges
To U.C. from	33.4%	33.4%	33.2%
From U.C. to	31.0	27.3	41.7

Table II-2 indicates that approximately 1/3 of tenure faculty are recruited from, or depart to, nine ranking universities, 1/3 from, or to, 31 other universities that are members of the Association of American Universities and 1/3 from all other American Universities and Colleges. Since the nine ranking universities are members of AAU, the study of sources and destinations of tenured University faculty reveals that approximately 2/3 of tenured University faculty come from or depart to institutions who are members of AAU.

The American Association of Universities presently includes 48 member institutions in its prestigious ranks including 2 in Canada. Approximately one-half of the present members are public universities, half private, one is a church-related institution. Heavy emphasis is placed, in consideration of possible new members, on quality and variety of graduate and professional programs, library holdings, etc. Membership in the AAU also qualifies member institutions for membership in the Association of Graduate Schools in the United States.

The Association of American Universities members are:

Brown University
California Institute of Technology
Catholic University of America
Clark University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
Harvard University
Indiana University
Iowa State University
Johns Hopkins University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
McGill University*
Michigan State University
New York University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Pennsylvania State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Stanford University
Syracuse University
Tulane University
University of California at Berkeley
University of California at Davis
University of California at Los Angeles

(Continued on next page)

* Canadian Universities

[1] Ibid., p. 6.

[2] The nine "ranking Universities" are: Harvard, Stanford, Princeton, Yale, Columbia, Chicago, Michigan, Illinois and Wisconsin.

(Association of American Universities members, Continued)

University of California at San Diego
University of California at Santa Barbara
University of Chicago
University of Colorado
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska
University of North Carolina
University of Pennsylvania
University of Rochester
University of Texas
University of Toronto*
University of Virginia
University of Washington, Seattle
University of Wisconsin
Vanderbilt University
Washington University, St. Louis
Yale University

*Canadian Universities

The Comparison 19

On several occasions the Council staff has proposed to the University that its major competition for faculty is not well identified by the institutions which are members of the American Association of Universities. For example, there appears to be little exchange of faculty between the University of California and Clark University, or Catholic University of America, or New York University, or Syracuse University, or Tulane University, or the University of Missouri, or the University of Nebraska, or the University of Virginia, or Vanderbilt University and several other member institutions of AAU. The use of AAU member institutions as a defined group of competing institutions is further complicated by the fact that the membership continues to expand--e. g., two institutions were just recently granted membership.

The Council staff has attempted to identify the major sources of institutional competition the University has experienced in the area of faculty recruitment and retention. One particularly significant grouping consists of the Ivy League Institutions (minus Dartmouth because of their lack of graduate emphasis) plus the Big Ten plus Chicago and Stanford. They are:

Ivy League

Brown University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Harvard University
Princeton University
University of Pennsylvania
Yale University

Big Ten

Indiana University
Michigan State University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Purdue University
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Wisconsin

University of Chicago
Stanford University

This grouping of nineteen institutions most clearly defines the institutions with which the University competes for faculty. A 1963 study of the Council which examined the institution of last prior appointment of staff members appointed to the University over a five-year period concluded that:

> The average faculty member in all three segments of public higher education in California has had a previous appointment at another academic institution. The major sources of recruitment for the University of California were the Big Ten schools of the midwest and the Ivy League schools on the eastern seaboard.[1]

The summary tables in the Council's report (see page II-14 point up the desirability of excluding Dartmouth from consideration and adding Chicago and Stanford to the list.

It is proposed that these 19 institutions be used as University of California comparison institutions for developing recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor on faculty salaries and fringe benefits.

The use of these institutions would continue to recognize the desirability of the University to maintain its historic status among the great institutions of the country. An expanded list from the present 8 further offers the advantage that an extreme variation of salary level at one institution does not have a pronounced effect on the whole.

Table II-3 shows the median salary for the proposed 19 comparison institutions, the University of California, and the former comparison groups of 5 and 8 institutions.

Table II-3

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA TO MEDIAN OF AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES AT 19 INSTITUTIONS[2]

			Basis for Past Legislative Consideration		
		19	Comparison	Comparison	8
Year	UC[3]	Institutions	5	Adjusted to U.C. Staffing Pattern	Not Adjusted to U.C. Staffing Pattern
1961-62	$10,187		$10,367		
1962-63	10,735		10,786		
1963-64	10,803	$10,366	11,151		
1964-65	11,190	11,450	11,595		
1965-66	11,614	12,451	11,455		
1966-67	12,095	13,124	12,211	$12,130	$12,657
1967-68	12,892	13,855		12,967	13,265
1968-69	13,705	14,548*		13,684	13,962
1969-70		15,149*		14,418*	14,832*

* Projected

[1] The 19 institutions are:

From the Ivy League: Brown University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Harvard University, Princeton University, University of Pennsylvania, Yale University

From the Big Ten: Indiana University, Michigan State University, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Purdue University, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Wisconsin

Plus: University of Chicago and Stanford University

[2] AAUP Bulletin

[3] Average salaries reported to CCHE by the University include "Associates" and exclude schools of law and all 11-month appointees. See pages III-3 and III-10 - III-11.

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

There has been reluctance on the part of many persons to support using prominent state universities for salary comparisons with the State Colleges because these institutions grant relatively large numbers of doctorates, or because of other functional differences. Thirteen institutions among the current list of 18 comparison institutions rank among the 100 leading doctorate-granting institutions in the country as measured from 1960 to 1966. Six of these rank within the top 25 in numbers of doctorates granted during those years.

Table II-4

100 LEADING DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS, 1960-66[1]

1. U. of Cal., Berkeley	3,228	26. U. of Southern Cal.	1,239	51. U. of Utah	547	76. U. of Cincinnati	349
2. U. of Illinois	3,224	27. U. of Washington	1,197	52. Western Reserve U.	531	77. Kansas State U.	314
3. U. of Wisconsin	3,143	28. Princeton U.	1,194	53. Oregon State U.	529	78. U. of Denver	309
4. Harvard U.	3,057	29. U. of Pittsburgh	912	54. Carnegie Inst. of Tech.	507	79. U. of Arkansas	301
5. Columbia U.	2,690	30. U. of N. Carolina	877	55. U. of Tennessee	490	80. Peabody Teachers Coll.	299
6. U. of Michigan	2,561	31. U. of Florida	866	56. Colorado State Coll.	485	81. Rice U.	297
7. New York U.	2,331	32. U. of Maryland	863	*57. Brown U.	479	82. U. of Georgia	283
8. Ohio State U.	2,213	*33. Rutgers U.	862	58. Texas A & M U.	454	83. U. of Alabama	282
*9. U. of Minnesota	2,139	34. U. of Missouri	835	59. U. of Virginia	453	*84. U. of Kentucky	277
10. Stanford U.	2,009	35. Boston U.	820	60. Fordham U.	452	85. American U.	274
11. Indiana U.	1,987	36. Johns Hopkins U.	807	61. U. of Connecticut	447	86. Georgetown U.	267
*12. Purdue U.	1,979	*37. Colorado U.	797	62. U. of Cal., Davis	439	87. Illinois Inst. of Tech.	263
13. Mass. Inst. of Tech.	1,911	38. Duke U.	776	63. Washington U. (Mo.)	438	88. George Washington U.	231
14. Cornell U.	1,823	39. Catholic U.	739	64. U. of Notre Dame	428	89. Delaware U.	230
*15. Michigan State U.	1,823	40. U. of Kansas	684	65. N. Carolina State U.	425	90. Lehigh U.	228
16. U. of Chicago	1,816	41. Syracuse U.	660	66. U. of Arizona	414	91. Virginia Polytech. Inst.	225
17. Yale U.	1,772	42. U. of Nebraska	644	67. Washington State U.	401	*92. Brandeis U.	219
18. U. of Cal., L.A.	1,658	43. U. of Oklahoma	633	68. Tulane U.	392	93. U. of Houston	210
19. U. of Texas	1,552	44. Louisiana State U.	630	69. Vanderbilt U.	378	94. Loyola U. (Ill.)	207
20. U. of Pennsylvania	1,375	45. Cal. Inst. of Tech.	615	70. Temple U.	369	95. U. of New Mexico	205
*21. Pennsylvania State U.	1,373	46. Florida State U.	614	71. Poly. Inst. of Brooklyn	368	96. Emory U.	198
22. U. of Iowa	1,346	*47. Wayne State U.	585	72. St. U. of N.Y., Buffalo	363	97. Claremont Grad. School	191
23. Teach. Coll., Columbia	1,294	*48. U. of Oregon	584	73. St. Louis U.	360	98. Yeshiva U.	191
*24. Northwestern U.	1,278	49. Oklahoma State U.	572	74. Rensselaer Poly. Inst.	359	99. Georgia Inst. of Tech.	188
*25. Iowa State U.	1,240	50. U. of Rochester	548	75. Case Inst. of Tech.	356	100. U. of Wyoming	184

From fiscal year 1960 through 1966, American universities awarded 92,863 doctoral degrees. The above table shows the 100 leading doctorate-granting institutions and the number of degrees awarded by each. The information was compiled from Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities 1958-1966, (*National Academy of Sciences*).

*State College comparison institutions

The Education Directory (1966-67) classifies the State College campuses in terms of highest level of training offered and types of programs[2] as follows:

1.	California State College Bakersfield	(not established)
2.	California State College, Dominguez Hills	(IIb)
3.	California State Polytechnic College, Kellogg-Voorhis	(IIe)
4.	Sonoma State College	(IIe)
5.	California State College, Long Beach	(IIIe)
6.	California State College, Los Angeles	(IIIe)
7.	Sacramento State College	(IIIe)

---

[1]The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 7, 1967, p. 5.

[2]See pages II-3 and II-4 for definitions of the classification categories.

8.	San Fernando Valley State College	(IIIe)
9.	Stanislaus State College	(IIIe)
10.	California State College Hayward	(IIIf)
11.	California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo	(IIIf)
12.	Chico State College	(IIIf)
13.	Fresno State College	(IIIf)
14.	Humboldt State College	(IIIf)
15.	San Jose State College	(IIIf)
16.	California State College, Fullerton	(IIIj)
17.	San Diego State College	(IIIk)
18.	San Francisco State College	(IIIk)

The institutions in the current list of comparison institutions are classified in the following manner:

1.	Brooklyn College	(IIIf)
2.	Brown University	(IVe)
3.	Purdue University	(IVh)
4.	Brandeis University	(IVj)
5.	State University of New York (Albany)	(IVj)
6.	Bowling Green State University	(IVk)
7.	University of Colorado	(IVk)
8.	Iowa State University	(IVk)
9.	University of Kentucky	(IVk)
10.	University of Massachusetts (Amherst)	(IVk)
11.	Michigan State University	(IVk)
12.	University of Minnesota	(IVk)
13.	Northwestern University	(IVk)
14.	University of Oregon	(IVk)
15.	Pennsylvania State University	(IVk)
16.	Rutgers State University	(IVk)
17.	Southern Illinois University	(IVk)
18.	Wayne State University	(IVk)

Only one (Brooklyn College) of the current list of eighteen comparison institutions for the State Colleges falls into a classification held by several of the State Colleges. All others, denoted by the classification IV, offer the doctor of philosophy and equivalent degrees.

The Education Directory, 1966-67, classifies 2,252 institutions of higher education in the United States. Of these, 1,008 institutions are classified into the same categories as the State Colleges. A summary is provided in Table II-5.

The latest AAUP Report on the Profession contains average salary and compensation data for 654 liberal arts colleges (204 public, 153 private independent, and 297 church-related) and 48 teachers colleges (45 public, and 3 private independent).[1] Table II-6 shows how salaries for the past five years

---

[1]In general, the AAUP classifications for liberal arts colleges and teachers colleges represent institutions of higher education having functional assignments similar to the State Colleges.

Table II-5

NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, BY TYPE OF PROGRAM AND HIGHEST LEVEL OF OFFERING, WITHIN STATE COLLEGE CATEGORIES, 1966-67

Type of program	Total	Highest level of offering	
		II	III
		Only the bachelor's and/or first professional degree	Master's and/or second professional degree
Total	1,008	638	370
b--Liberal arts and general--------	92	77	15
e--Both liberal arts and general and teacher preparatory---------	569	385	184
f--Liberal arts and general, terminal-occupational, and teacher preparatory----------	151	109	42
j--Liberal arts and general with 1 or 2 professional schools-----	133	65	68
k--Liberal arts and general with 3 or more professional schools--	63	2	61

Source: Education Directory, 1966-67, U.S. Office of Education.

in the State Colleges relate to salaries paid by public and private liberal arts colleges as reported by AAUP.

Table II-6

RELATIONSHIP OF RANK SALARIES IN THE
STATE COLLEGES TO RANK SALARIES IN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES
(9-month basis)

	State Colleges	Liberal arts colleges public	Liberal arts colleges private
Professors			
1968-69	$17,020	$15,274	$15,079
67-68	15,794	14,411	14,118
66-67	15,096	13,503	13,270
65-66	14,136	12,552	12,475
64-65	13,008	11,670	11,826
Associate Professors			
1968-69	$12,732	$12,133	$11,653
67-68	11,914	11,491	10,894
66-67	11,460	10,755	10,256
65-66	10,836	10,075	9,716
64-65	10,032	9,429	9,171
Assistant Professors			
1968-69	$10,481	$10,120	$ 9,599
67-68	9,777	9,526	9,019
66-67	9,264	8,956	8,507
65-66	8,712	8,429	8,078
64-65	7,932	7,906	7,682
Instructors			
1968-69	$ 9,097	$ 8,005	$ 7,873
67-68	8,326	7,621	7,451
66-67	7,944	7,178	7,067
65-66	7,452	6,845	6,860
64-65	6,720	6,490	6,483

If, for example, the salaries by rank for 1968-69 are converted to all-ranks averages through adjustment to the State College staffing pattern the following relationships result:

1968-69, 9-month all-ranks average faculty salaries

California State Colleges	$12,814
Public Liberal Arts Colleges	11,979
Private Liberal Arts Colleges	11,575

It can be seen that present faculty salaries in the State Colleges are approximately 10 percent greater than salaries paid by institutions having similar functions. This is not a recent event, the data in Table II-6 indicates that the same differential has existed for at least five years, and in all probability for a much longer period of time.

Although many institutions in the United States have functional assignments similar to those of the State Colleges, as far back as 1940 State College faculty salaries have been compared to salaries paid by various combinations of colleges and universities, including universities with emphasis on programs leading to the doctorate.

It appears that the State of California via the Legislature and Governor over a period of many years has maintained a consistent pattern of including several major universities in the comparison group for the State Colleges thereby indicating their intent to pay salaries above those generally found in institutions having similar functions.

The concept of a comparison group of institutions for the State Colleges composed entirely of institutions having similar functions should therefore continue to be rejected.

Public and Private Universities

The State Colleges have not conducted an extensive study of the flow of faculty members to and from the State Colleges.

A 1963 Council report drew a composite picture of the typical faculty member in each of the three segments of public higher education in California.[1] The study found that the average faculty member in all three segments has had a previous appointment at another academic institution. The most important sources for recruitment of faculty for the California State Colleges were identified by the study to be the University of California, the Big Ten schools, California private colleges and universities, and finally, faculty with previous experience in high schools.[2]

It has long been recognized that the State Colleges do compete with the University of California for faculty and that the Colleges likewise draw faculty from the nine ranking universities referred to by the University as as well as other institutions who are members of the Association of American Universities. One significant point brought out by the data contained in the Council's study of faculty was that the State Colleges recruit individuals with their last prior appointment from a wider range of institutions than the University. Similarly, individuals are recruited who have earned their highest degree at a wider range of institutions.

In order to take into account the direct competition for faculty between the University and the State Colleges, the competition for faculty

---

[1] Faculty Opinion Toward Salary, Fringe Benefits, and Working Conditions, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Number 1007, August 1963.

[2] Ibid., p. 9.

Table II-7

INSTITUTION OF LAST PRIOR APPOINTMENT OF STAFF MEMBERS APPOINTED TO CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
1957-58 - 1961-62

Institution of Last Prior Appointment	Total		Staff Members Appointed To: University of California		State Colleges		Junior Colleges	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
University of Arizona	6	*	2	1	4	1	-	-
University of California, Berkeley	21	2	1	-	15	2	5	1
University of California, Los Angeles	22	2	-	-	19	3	3	1
University of California, Davis	4	-	1	-	3	-	-	-
University of California, Other	3	-	1	-	2	-	-	-
California Institute of Technology	3	-	3	1	-	-	-	-
University of Chicago	7	1	7	2	-	-	-	-
Claremont Colleges	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
University of Colorado	4	-	2	1	2	-	-	-
Colorado State College	4	-	-	-	4	1	-	-
Columbia University	7	1	6	2	1	-	-	-
Cornell University	8	1	5	2	2	-	1	-
University of Denver	4	-	-	-	4	1	-	-
Fresno State College	6	-	-	-	4	-	2	1
Harvard University	9	1	6	2	3	-	-	-
University of Illinois	12	1	5	2	7	1	-	-
University of Indiana	6	-	1	-	5	1	-	-
University of Iowa	13	1	6	2	7	1	-	-
Iowa State University	6	-	2	1	3	-	1	-
University of Kansas	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Long Beach State College	5	-	1	-	3	-	1	-
Los Angeles State College	5	-	1	-	4	1	-	-
Mills College	5	-	2	1	1	-	2	1
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	4	-	2	1	2	-	-	-
University of Michigan	5	-	2	1	3	-	-	-
Michigan State University	9	1	2	1	7	1	-	-
University of Minnesota	9	1	6	2	2	-	1	-
University of Missouri	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
New York University	5	-	1	-	1	-	3	1
North Western University	4	-	3	1	1	-	-	-
Occidental College	4	-	1	-	3	-	-	-
Ohio State University	8	1	4	1	3	-	1	-
University of Oklahoma	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
University of Oregon	11	1	1	-	8	1	2	1
Oregon State University	5	-	-	-	4	1	1	-
University of Pennsylvania	3	-	2	1	1	-	-	-
Princeton University	8	1	7	2	1	-	-	-
Purdue University	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
University of Redlands	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Sacramento State College	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
San Diego State College	4	-	-	-	3	-	1	-
San Francisco State College	5	-	-	-	4	1	1	-
San Jose State College	5	-	-	-	4	1	1	-
University of Southern California	24	2	-	-	18	3	6	2
Stanford University	15	1	7	2	8	1	-	-
University of Texas	5	-	2	1	3	-	-	-
University of Utah	7	1	1	-	5	1	1	-
University of Washington	10	1	3	-	7	1	-	-
University of Wisconsin	9	1	4	1	5	1	-	-
Yale University	5	-	5	2	-	-	-	-
Other California State Colleges	9	1	-	-	8	1	1	-
Foreign Universities	24	2	11	4	10	2	3	1
California Junior Colleges	62	5	2	1	22	3	38	11
Out of State Junior Colleges	5	-	-	-	-	-	5	1
High Schools	136	11	3	1	39	6	94	28
All Other Colleges	252	20	53	18	171	26	28	8
Graduate School	206	16	58	20	75	12	73	22
Outside Academic Field	235	18	53	19	127	19	55	16
No Response	12	1	1	-	7	1	4	1
Total	1,280	100	287	100	656	100	337	100

*Less Than 1%

1CCHE No. 1007, Faculty Opinion Toward Salary, Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions. August 1963.

from institutions that are members of AAU, and the wider range of institutions from which the State Colleges recruit faculty, it is proposed that institutions which fall into the AAUP classifications of Public Universities and Private Universities[1] be used for salary and fringe benefit comparison purposes for the State Colleges.

The proposed list of comparison institutions includes the following:

The Major Public University Within Each State

University of Alabama
University of Alaska
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of California
University of Colorado
University of Connecticut
University of Delaware
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Idaho
University of Illinois
Indiana University
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
Louisiana State University
University of Maine
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Mississippi
University of Missouri
University of Montana
University of Nebraska
University of Nevada
University of New Hampshire
Rutgers State University
University of New Mexico
SUNY at Buffalo
University of North Carolina
University of North Dakota
Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Rhode Island
University of South Carolina
University of South Dakota
University of Tennessee
University of Texas
University of Utah
University of Vermont
University of Virginia
University of Washington
West Virginia University
University of Wisconsin
University of Wyoming
University of Hawaii
Pennsylvania State University

(50 Institutions)

Other Public Universities Who Satisfy the Definitional Requirements

Auburn University
Arizona State University
Colorado State University
Florida State University
Purdue University
Iowa State University
Kansas State University
Michigan State University
Wayne State University
Mississippi State University
New Mexico State University
North Dakota State University
University of Cincinnati
Oklahoma State University
Oregon State University
University of Houston

(Continued on next page)

[1]AAUP defines Universities to include: (1) institutions which have a minimum of two professional schools, which offer the doctorate degree, and which confer in the period 1960-66 an annual average of 15 or more earned doctorates covering a minimum of three nonrelated disciplines and (2) the major public university within each state even though it does not meet the above criteria.

(Other Public Universities Who Satisfy the Definitional Requirements, Continued)

Texas A & M University
Texas Technological College
Utah State University
Washington State University

(20 institutions)

Private Institutions Classified by AAUP As Universities

Stanford University
University of Southern California
Yale University
George Washington University
Illinois Institute of Technology
Northwestern University
University of Chicago
Tulane University
Johns Hopkins University
Boston University
Brandeis University
Clark University
Harvard University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Tufts University
Washington University, St. Louis
Princeton University
Columbia University
Columbia Teachers College
Cornell University
New York University
Syracuse University
University of Rochester
Duke University
Case Western Reserve
Lehigh University
Temple University
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
Brown University
Vanderbilt University
Rice University

(32 institutions)

A grant total of 102 institutions.

Table II-8 shows that the median salary for the 102 comparison institutions has closely paralleled the salary history of the California State Colleges.

Table II-8

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES AT THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE TO MEDIAN OF AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES AT 102 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

Year	CSC	(Median) 102 Public and Private Universities	Basis for Past Legislative Consideration: Comparison 10	Comparison 18: Adjusted to CSC Staffing Pattern	Comparison 18: Not Adjusted to CSC Staffing Pattern
1963-64	$ 9,216	$ 9,257	$ 9,893		
1964-65	9,696	9,769	10,291		
1965-66	10,624	10,438	10,795		
1966-67	11,280	10,947		$11,551	$11,369
1967-68	11,908	11,969		12,512	12,143
1968-69	12,814	12,850*		13,307	13,028
1969-70		13,656		14,118*	13,807*

SOURCE: AAUP Bulletin. Not all institutions reported in 1963.

*Projected

In summary, the use of institutions from which faculty are recruited rather than those that have similar functions will (1) continue past recognition that the California State Colleges are in a different faculty market than their counterparts in other states--i.e., the State has been willing to place the State Colleges at the highest level of quality in terms of faculty resources and (2) continue present salary trends without building in a one time precipitous decrease in State College faculty salaries by changing to a different base of comparison institutions.

Chapter III

CALCULATING PROCEDURES

The timing for the Council's annual report on faculty salaries and welfare benefits at the University of California and the California State Colleges presents the greatest problem associated with preparation of the report. Since the date when the Council needs to forward its recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature cannot be moved to a later time, a revised procedure for developing the basic recommendations centered around eliminating the timing problem is presented below. Further, several changes in data handling are proposed.

Use of AAUP Data

Data on faculty salaries and compensation contained in the summer issue of the AAUP Bulletin has always been used by the Council, with support from the segments, as a basis for recommendations on appropriate levels for countable fringe benefits at the University and the State Colleges.

It is proposed that these published data also serve as a basis for recommendations on appropriate salary levels.

Since these data are normally published in June for the concluding academic year and segmental data for the current academic year can be available by early October, the Council staff's report can be completed by mid-October for consideration by the Regents, the Trustees and the Council. This will allow sufficient time for the Council to devote adequate attention to the important matter of faculty salaries and fringe benefits before submitting their recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature not later than December 1.

Advantages of Using AAUP Data

(1) The major advantage derived from using AAUP data is that the difficult data acquisition problems associated with the present method will be eliminated. Each year more and more institutions submit reports to AAUP. A total of 925 institutions submitted data for the 1967-68 survey.

(2) Since it will no longer be necessary for the segments to collect comparative salary and countable fringe benefit data, more time can be devoted to study of special benefits, quality of benefits, salary relationships of other state college or university personnel, segmental salary structures and procedures, recruiting sources and destinations of departing faculty members, job satisfactions, and other important matters relating to faculty welfare and benefits.

(3) The use of AAUP data means that it will no longer be necessary to limit the number of comparison institutions due to the difficulties encountered in securing and compiling data. The number of

comparison institutions for each segment can be greatly expanded. The market for faculty is essentially a national market--it is not five, eight, ten, or eighteen institutions that have been selected by representatives from various agencies and the segments and termed comparison institutions.

The proposed expansion in number of institutions used for comparison is discussed in Chapter II. It is proposed that the comparison group for the University be composed of the Ivy League institutions (minus Dartmouth), the Big Ten, plus the University of Chicago and Stanford University--a total of 19 institutions.

For the State Colleges, the staff proposes expanding the list of comparison institutions to 102 public and private universities.

A large number of comparison institutions will reduce the effect caused by unusual changes in salary levels at one institution. An example of these effects arose in last year's report to the Council when unusually high increases granted by one of the eighteen State College comparison institutions changed the level of salary parity by 2% out of 10.2%, or, in other words, unusual changes at one institution accounted for approximately 20% of the indicated increase needed for parity.

(4) From the standpoint of the Council staff the data contained in the AAUP report appears to be more accurate than the data collected as estimates--due to the timing of the report--under present constraints.

Disadvantages in Using AAUP Data

(1) The AAUP Report "The Economic Status of the Profession" is published in June of every year covering the concluding academic year; i.e., the June 1968 issue contained institutional data for the 1967-68 academic year. This "lag" will require two-year projections of data for the comparison institutions, rather than only one-year projections.

This is not viewed as a serious disadvantage.

Both the Council staff and the University have examined the results of two-year projections by various methodologies and find that two-year projections based on the simple average of year-to-year changes produce good results. (The University has found, for example, that two-year projections for its present group of eight comparison institutions on an unweighted basis resulted in the largest error of estimate equal to 0.04%).

(2) For several years the University has issued a critique of the annual AAUP report on faculty salaries and fringe benefits which discusses two "major limiting characteristics" of the AAUP data indicating these two characteristics inhibit meaningful analysis.

One point discussed is that the salary data is published only on an all-ranks average basis for any given institution. (This point is not considered by Council staff to be a limiting characteristic and is discussed in a subsequent section.)

The second point relates to possible ambiguities in the data due to changes in the directions to an institution which accompany the AAUP questionnaire. The directions given to institutions specify those employees who are to be included as full-time faculty members. The Bulletin states,[1]

> "Number of Full-Time Faculty Members indicates the number of persons reported as full-time faculty members and included in the computations. The directions requested that administrative officers, librarians, athletic coaches, teachers in laboratory schools, etc., whose functions are not primarily academic instruction, should not be included in the tabulated numbers or compensations even if they hold a title of academic rank, that persons retired or on leave without salary should not be counted, and that persons on sabbatical or other leave with 'full' salary should be included at that salary although they chose a full year leave at half pay. Church affiliated institutions should include lay faculty members but exclude clerical faculty members who donate part or all of their services. Unless separate reports are provided, as in the case of preclinical departments of medical schools, the directions indicated that the report should cover the 'entire institution' always excluding medical, dental and nursing schools, summer sessions, laboratory schools, and extension programs and evening or Saturday classes of similar nature.

This definition of full-time faculty has remained essentially unchanged for at least six years.

The Council staff does not share the same concern as the University on this matter. While visiting the State College comparison institutions this concern was discussed with several individuals who complete the questionnaire for AAUP. Every indication was that they (the institutions) reported to AAUP the same data sought by the Council and the Colleges which, in turn fit the definition of AAUP. It was ironic when one institution requested a Council staff member to encourage the University of California to report its data in accordance with

---

[1] "The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1967-68", AAUP Bulletin, Summer 1968, p. 207.

instructions from AAUP. The University excludes several schools and colleges and certain positions from its data, and includes position titles which other institutions do not include.

Each of the current eighteen State College comparison institutions sent copies of its 1966 report to AAUP to Council staff. If there is a point of concern about the validity of institutional reports it certainly does not apply to these institutions.

(3) One possible point of difficulty with the use of AAUP data is that the average salaries for each institution includes those persons holding full-time appointments in the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor and lecturer. The inclusion of the lecturer category may have some distorting influence because of its variations in meaning among institutions of higher education. In some cases it is a high paying title and in others it represents low paying positions. Whatever the title may mean, these positions do represent an amount of money which is necessary for the institution to carry on its instructional function and should therefore be included. However, the amount of possible distortion is minor because only a small fraction of total faculty carry this title.

Weighting of Faculty Data

The calculating procedures adopted by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee call for weighting of the comparison institutions data by the number of persons within each rank. Studies of faculty flow which have been conducted by the University indicate clearly that the application of this weighting procedure is inappropriate. That is, the number of faculty recruited from one of the comparison institutions bears no relationship to the size of faculty at that particular institution.

Results of the 1963 Council study showing the institution of last prior appointment of staff members appointed to California's public institution of higher education are reproduced in Table II-7. These data show there is no relationship between the size of an institution and the numbers of faculty recruited from that institution; hence, there is no justification for continuing the weighting of faculty salary data. The proposed method for determining recommended salary increases relies on salaries paid by the median institution rather than on a weighted average method of computation.

Adjusting to the Staffing Pattern of the California Segment

The report adopted by HR 250 which sets forth the procedure for treating salary data specifies that "salary data be reported in a

form by rank which compensates for differences in faculty distributions."[1] The Legislative Analyst noted the distorting influence caused by the adjustments for the staffing pattern of the California segments.[2]

This aspect of the calculating procedure has lead to the term "adjusted mean" salaries. The adjusted mean is derived by multiplying the weighted average salary for each academic rank at the comparison institutions by the number of faculty in each academic rank at the University or the State Colleges, then dividing by the total number of faculty in all the ranks at the University or the State Colleges. The original purpose of the adjustment was, in effect, an attempt to provide in the California segments professors' salaries equal to professors' salaries at the comparison institutions, associate professors' salaries equal to associate professors' salaries at the comparison institutions, assistant professors' salaries equal to assistant professors' salaries at the comparison institutions, and instructors' salaries equal to instructors' salaries at the comparison institutions.

On several occasions, the Council staff has expressed concern about the adjustment of average salaries by rank. This concern has centered around three points.

(1) Although the stated qualifications for any one of the four faculty ranks may appear similar for different institutions, the fact remains that assignment of rank is, in a sense, arbitrary. Institutions of higher education, because of their differing objectives and programs, tend to award certain preparation and experiences of prospective faculty members differing values. For example, California State Polytechnic College does not pretend to be looking for individuals with the same background and experience as Northwestern University; hence, rank assignments are entirely different. While this may be an extreme example, subtle differences in rank assignments exist among all institutions.

The interest of the state is in the total dollars required to carry on the instructional function which is indicated by the average faculty salary at an institution--the calculating method should not include adjustments for somewhat arbitrary rank assignments.

(2) If the comparison institutions are equivalent in all respects then one would not anticipate the staffing pattern for a California segment to differ from the staffing pattern within the comparison institutions. That is, no adjustment for differences in faculty distribution would be necessary.

(3) In the 1967 Report, the Council staff commented on the upward shift in ranks at the State Colleges as follows: "the trend of increasing percentage of State College faculty in the upper two ranks is continuing."[3] This trend continued into 1968-69. When one observes

---

[1]"A Recommended Method for Reporting to the Legislature on Faculty Salaries and Other Benefits at the University of California and the California State Colleges." Office of the Legislative Analyst, January 4, 1965.

[2]Ibid. p. 864.

[3]Annual Report on Salaries and Other Benefits at the California State Colleges and the University of California, 1968-69, CCHE No. 1031, April 1968, p. 6.

the trend by examining the percentage of faculty in each rank, the effect of the trend is difficult to envision. The effect can best be observed by noting the results of adjusting faculty salaries to the different distributions of faculty.

The unadjusted all-ranks average salary (percentage rank distribution equal to that of the comparison institutions) projected for the State College comparison institutions in 1969-70 is $13,807, indicating a need for 7.7% increase in average salaries in the State Colleges. When rank salaries are adjusted to the 1968-69 State College rank distribution, the all-ranks average shifts to $14,118, indicating a need for a 10.2% increase in average salaries in the State Colleges. Thus 2.5% (10.2-7.7), or approximately 25%, of the indicated need for increase in average salaries is caused by the difference between the rank distribution in the State Colleges and the comparison institutions.

In addition, changes from year to year in the distribution of the California State Colleges' faculty among the ranks affect the projected salary levels. To illustrate the effect of last year's change in distribution, the 1967-68 rank distribution of the State Colleges was applied to the projected rank salaries. This results in an adjusted all-ranks average figure of $13,943 or indicates a need for an increase of 8.8%. In other words, the change in rank distribution in the State Colleges between 1967-68 and 1968-69 alone accounts for 10.2-8.8 or 1.4% of the indicated increase in funds needed to maintain comparable rank salaries. The State College staffing pattern is skewed toward higher ranks than the comparison institutions and the trend toward further skewing of the pattern is continuing.

Table III-1

SUMMARY OF STAFFING PATTERN INFLUENCE IN INDICATED NEED FOR SALARY INCREASES IN 1969-70 CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

	1969-70	Actual 1968-69 California State Colleges	Difference	Indicated % Increase
Projected all-ranks average salary at comparison institutions staffing pattern	$13,807	$12,814	$993	7.7%
Projected all-ranks average salary at 1968-69 California State Colleges staffing pattern	$14,102	$12,814	$1,288	10.2%
Projected all-ranks average salary at 1967-68 California State Colleges staffing pattern	$13,943	$12,814	$1,129	8.8%

In the case of the University of California, the effect of "adjusting" is reversed. If the average salary of the University's comparison institutions is adjusted so that the institutions have, in effect, the same distribution of faculty among the ranks as the University, the resultant figure in 1969-70 is $14,418 indicating a need for a 5.2% raise in the University's average all-ranks salary. If, on the other hand, the University operated with a distribution among ranks equal to that of its comparison institutions, the all-ranks average salary would increase to $14,832, indicating need for an 8.2% increase. Adjustment to the 1967-68 staffing pattern rather than the 1968-69 pattern results in an all-ranks average salary of $14,365 indicating need for a 4.8% increase.

The University staffing pattern changed little between 1967-68 and 1968-69. Taken as a whole, the staffing pattern of the University is skewed toward lower ranks in comparison to the composite pattern of its present eight comparison institutions.

Table III-2

SUMMARY OF STAFFING PATTERN INFLUENCE IN INDICATED NEED FOR SALARY INCREASES IN 1969-70 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

	1969-70	Actual 1968-69 University of California	Difference	Indicated % Increase
Projected all-ranks average salary at comparison institutions staffing pattern	$14,832	$13,705	$1,127	8.2%
Projected all-ranks average salary at 1968-69 University of California staffing pattern	$14,418	$13,705	$713	5.2%
Projected all-ranks average salary at 1967-68 University of California staffing pattern	$14,365	$13,705	$660	4.8%

Countable Fringe Benefits

The Legislative Analyst in commenting on the subject of fringe benefits states,

> No provision has been included in the Governor's Budget for faculty fringe benefits. The Coordinating Council recommended increases of 0.5 percent at the University and 3.8 percent at the state colleges. *The decision to not include these is consistent with the policy of not granting fringe benefit increases to other employees of the state.*[1] (Emphasis added)

It is certainly unusual if it is State policy to not grant fringe benefit increases to college and university faculty unless all other employees of the state receive increases. This point should be clarified. If this is State policy then there is no need for the Council to make recommendations in the area of fringe benefits. Further, if this is State policy then the appropriate agency should be requested to examine this policy in terms of practices in other states.

In the event the Council determines that it should continue to make recommendations in this area a revision of the procedure is suggested below.

Most of the past reports of the Council have compared salaries for the current year but fringe benefit comparisons have been made using data published by AAUP for the previous academic year. Exceptions to this procedure were made in the 1967-68 reports. In 1967 current salary and fringe benefit data from both groups of comparison instutions were available; in 1968 the State Colleges obtained current salary and fringe benefit data but the University obtained current salary data only from its comparison institutions. For the University it was necessary to resort again to published data (AAUP) on countable fringe benefits, which were for the previous year.

The Council examines total compensation paid to faculty. Total compensation includes salary and countable fringe benefits. Council staff proposes that countable fringe benefits be derived in the same manner as recommendations on salary levels. That is, using the proposed lists of comparison institutions and AAUP publications as the data source, dollar equivalents of countable fringe benefits at each institution can be determined. These equivalents on an institutional basis can then be projected to the appropriate budget year. The projections are to be based on the average of annual fringe benefit increases in the comparable institutions during the past five years. The median benefit level (in equivalent dollars) will serve as the basis for Council recommendations.

Table III-3 provides comparisons of institutional contributions toward countable fringe benefits between the California State Colleges and their proposed comparison group institutions and between the University and its proposed comparison group of institutions.

---

[1] Ibid. p. 864.

Table III-3

COMPARISONS OF COUNTABLE FRINGE BENEFITS CONTRIBUTIONS

	CSC	Median 102 - Public and Private Universities**	UC	Median - Comparison 19
1963-64	$ 716	$ 928	$ 974	$1,381
1964-65	843	988	994	1,531
1965-66	1,006	1,157	1,053	1,690
1966-67	1,053	1,323	1,454	1,840
1967-68	1,148	1,358	1,608	1,895
1968-69	1,257	1,719*	1,676*	2,075*

* Projected
** Excludes those institutions having retirement programs that do not vest in the individual within five years.

SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS DATA TO BE REPORTED TO COUNCIL STAFF BY THE CALIFORNIA SEGMENTS

Confusion has existed for a number of years in regard to what positions are included in the salary summaries for the University and the State Colleges. For the last two years the reporting forms developed by Council staff for use by the California segments have asked for a definition of "full-time faculty."

The University responded by defining full-time faculty as "those faculty members whose actual total F.T.E. for all assignments is 1.00." Since 1967 professional personnel in academic titles at the University have been divided into four major budgetary classifications: (1) faculty, with sub-classifications of Group I and Group II, (2) auxiliary staff, with sub-classifications of Group I and Group II, (3) teaching staff, with no budget account numbers in the classification, and (4) other academic. Faculty, Group I, includes the account titles of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. Faculty, Group II, includes the account titles of Associate in _____, Instruction Supervisor, Lecturer, Clinical Staff, and Physical Education Supervisor.

The practice of the Council has been to exclude faculty in the schools of law, medicine, and dentistry; while AAUP asks institutions to always exclude medical, dental and nursing schools, summer sessions, laboratory schools, and extension programs. AAUP does not exclude faculty in schools of law. A sample of responses from institutions who are members of AAU indicates that faculties in schools of law are included in their reports. Therefore, to be consistent, the University should include

faculty from law. Further, all institutions sampled indicate they include department chairmen in their data. To be consistent the University should do likewise if it is not done already.

On several occasions questions have arisen as to why average salaries for the rank of instructor at the University has been reported at a level considerably below the lowest salary step for the rank (the salary schedule provides only one salary level). Recent correspondence from the University states that this results from the inclusion of those persons holding the title of Associate. These persons are at a salary that may be considered in the junior instructor, or sub-instructor, level. This category, unless special circumstances exist, should not be included by the University in their reporting of faculty salaries. Further, it is customary for institutions of higher education to include salaries paid full-time faculty members employed on a 11- or 12-month basis with appropriate conversion to 9-month equivalent. The University has reported only faculty members having 9-month appointments.

The University in the past has reported budget data only; in the future, time permitting, the University should report actual payroll data.

The State Colleges responded by defining full-time faculty as follows:

> "All faculty assigned to fill a full-time position. The duties of a position may vary but are normally carried out by providing instruction which is the equivalent of 12 weighted teaching units of undergraduate courses or 10 weighted teaching units of graduate courses. Other assignments usually the equivalent of 3 weighted teaching units are also normal."

Under this definition the State Colleges have included positions which the comparison institutions do not include and, further, many of the positions included lie outside the definition of AAUP. For example, the State Colleges have included all employees in the class codes of counselor, counselor and test officer, placement officer, publications manager, test officer, and vocational instructor, in addition to instructional faculty. In preparing faculty data for the Council the State Colleges should exclude from the comparison those positions having functions which are not primarily academic instruction even if the particular individuals in these classifications hold a title of academic rank.

In order to clarify the personnel, and associated salaries, to be included in the segmental reports to the Council, the following excerpts from definitions and instructions which are contained in the directions for completing the questionnaire for the annual AAUP salary and compensation survey should be followed by the University and the State Colleges:[1]

---

[1]See page III-3 for additional information on personnel to be included in the reports.

1. UNITS AND PERSONNEL. Include the entire institution except medical, dental, and nursing schools, summer sessions, laboratory schools, and extension programs and evening or Saturday classes of similar nature. (Faculty members holding joint appointments in two separate reporting units should be counted only once.)

2. FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF. (1) Report: faculty members whose major regular assignment is instruction, including those with released time for research; department chairmen without other administrative titles, and faculty members on sabbatical leave with full or part pay at their regular academic-year salaries. (2) Do not report: librarians and athletic coaches unless their function is primarily instructional; deans, asociate deans, counselors, or other individuals whose primary function is not instructional, even though they nominally teach "half-time"; . . . teaching assistants, junior instructors, or other sub-instructors who are graduate students in the institution in which they teach, even though they may hold a "full-time" appointment.

3. SALARIES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF. . . . report salary for two semesters or three quarters . . . . When the contract is for longer periods and the salary is not stated for two semesters or three quarters . . . salaries for 11 or 12 months of actual service should be reduced to a 9-month basis by a conversion factor of 9/11 (81.8 percent) or by the announced formula of the institution [segment].

Chapter IV

SUMMARY

A Revised Procedure For Reporting to the Legislature and Governor on Faculty Salaries and Other Benefits at the University of California and the California State Colleges

The proposed revisions in the procedure for reporting to the Legislature and the Governor on faculty salaries and benefits deal with (1) comparison institutions, (2) the source of data for the comparison institutions, and (3) calculating procedures leading to the development of staff recommendations for Council consideration. No changes are recommended in other aspects of the composition of the annual report such as faculty data, information on faculty turnover, salaries for the various ranks and related matters.

Each of the proposed changes is discussed in Chapters I, II and III. The changes are summarized here for reference.

COMPARISON INSTITUTIONS

University of California

The staff proposes that the Ivy League institutions (minus Dartmouth) plus the Big Ten institutions plus the University of Chicago and Stanford University, a total of 19 institutions, be used as comparison institutions for the University. The particular institutions to be included in the University comparison group are identified in Chapter II.

California State Colleges

The staff proposes that the list of comparison institutions for the State Colleges be expanded to include the major public universities within each of the 50 states, 20 other public universities who satisfy the university definitional requirements of AAUP and 32 private institutions classified as universities by AAUP. The particular institutions to be included in the California State College comparison group are identified in Chapter II.

SOURCE OF DATA

Comparison Institutions

The annual report will be based upon salary, compensation, and other data for the comparison institutions which is published annually by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in their summer bulletin under the title, "The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession."

California Segments

During the first week in October of each year, the California segments shall submit current fiscal year payroll data on faculty salaries, fringe benefits, and other data the Council staff may request in order to comply with legislative, Council or other directives. (The reporting date for the segments will be influenced by the meeting schedule adopted by the Council. On occasions the meeting dates for the Council will necessitate the use of budget, rather than current, data on salaries.)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The use of AAUP data will require two-year projections of average salaries and compensation at each of the comparison institutions. Projections will be accomplished through the simple average of year-to-year changes over a six-year (five intervals) period.

The median of the projected average salaries at the comparison institutions for the next fiscal year will provide the basis for salary recommendations. In respect to the California State Colleges, the percentile to be used will be either the median or a higher percentile to be determined subsequent to the Council's determination of the amount of money required to restructure the salary scales currently used for faculty in the California State Colleges.

The median of the projected dollar equivalents of countable fringe benefits at the comparison institutions* will provide the basis for countable fringe benefit recommendations.

The Council staff will sample the groups of comparison institutions in order to determine the accuracy of the first year of the two-year projections.

---

*Data for those institutions which have undergone changes in the countability of retirement programs brought about by changes in their vesting policy during the six-year period are to be excluded. AAUP includes retirement programs as a countable fringe benefit to the extent that these benefits become vested in the faculty member in five years or less. Unless these data are omitted a change in vesting policies would be improperly reflected as a large change in fringe benefit contribution by the institution.

In the past, data from institutions having retirement programs which do not vest within five years have not been considered in Council recommendations because the quality of benefits are not equal to those offered by California. This practice should be continued.

APPENDIX

HISTORICAL USE OF COMPARISON INSTITUTIONS

In 1920 the University of California adopted an academic salary scale based upon a comparison with salaries of five other distinguished universities. This scale, except for $200 adjustments at the Instructor level and the minimum for the Professor ranks, remained in effect through 1944-45. Subsequently, University faculty participated in State salary increase funds upon demonstration that salary increase proposals were supported by the findings of a survey of rates in comparable employments.

In the 1950's mounting concern over the future of the nation's (and the state's) higher educational resources prompted overall review of the salary situation. As a result two major national reports were published in 1957 suggesting goals for faculty salaries; one report was the result of a four-year study conducted by the Educational Policies Committee of the National Education Association; the second, the 1957 report of President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, resulted from a study conducted by distinguished leaders in business and education. During the same year, a special Subcommittee of state officials and educators concluded a study of faculty salaries in California institutions of higher education and reported,

> "The University of California and the State Colleges cannot hope alone to make adjustments to match those of industry, but they should match the other comparable institutions in their efforts to make educational salaries more competitive with those of industry."[1]

The 1957 Subcommittee endorsed for both the University and the State Colleges the principle of comparability with salaries at those institutions with which each had maintained comparison. For the University, these institutions were: Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, and Yale. According to the University these were institutions with which the University competed for faculty and with which it ranked academically. In 1960 Princeton replaced Chicago in the comparison group.

The comparison group of the State Colleges for this period of time was not stated in the Subcommittee's salary report. From interviews with some members who participated in the 1957-58 study it is believed that 11 of the following 15 institutions were selected for salary comparisons for the State Colleges: Brooklyn College, New Jersey State Teachers Colleges, Oberlin College, Rutgers University, Southern Illinois University, Washington State College, State University of New York, and the Universities of Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, Toledo and Wayne State.

---

[1]"Statement of Findings and Recommendations on State College and University Faculty Salaries," report transmitted by the Subcommittee to Hon. Wallace D. Henderson, Member California State Assembly, May 21, 1957, p. 2.

Beginning in 1962, the University of California salary request was largely based upon rank-by-rank comparisons with the five leading institutions (Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, Princeton and Yale). They presented their request using a concept of "average compensation" (salaries plus institutional contributions to retirement systems) and showed percentage increases required, by rank, to regain the relationship enjoyed by the University in 1957-58. The proposed salary increases (December 1962) of the Trustees of the California State Colleges was also based on a rank-by-rank comparison. In support of the proposed increases various data were submitted, much of which dealt with declining salary differentials for selected years over a comparison group of out-of-state institutions (ranging in number of participants from 9 to 15 per year) and a group of 4 to 5 California private colleges and universities.[1]

The principle of comparability as a base for determining faculty salaries was accepted by the Coordinating Council at its November 28, 1962, meeting. A consideration which immediately arose was whether comparability should be sought by rank or by an overall figure for all ranks combined. The conclusion reached was that the "all ranks" approach is better for several reasons:

1. In expanding institutions . . . the majority of new faculty recruited enter at the rank of Instructor or Assistant Professor. The distribution of faculty by rank needs to be kept flexible in order to follow trends of the competition.

2. Specific percentage of increase by rank would tend to make recruiting inflexible.

3. It is a single index of central tendency that can be used to present a picture of salaries paid by various institutions and by industry to career staffs.

The 1957 Subcommittee of State officials mentioned above had been assigned the responsibility of examining the salary increase proposals of the State Colleges and the University of California, and to, "if possible, present a permanent measurement for academic salary purposes that would give proper weight to problems of recruitment, retention and competition in this professional employment area." Supporting data for the Subcommittee report included a paragraph listing the criteria used by the State Personnel Board in selecting 12 institutions "considered generally comparable to the State Colleges," stating:

> Accordingly, the State Personnel Board has selected for its salary studies some twelve institutions considered

---

[1] OUT-OF-STATE, 1962-63: Bowling Green State University, Brooklyn College, Clark University, Iowa State University, Kent State University, Oberlin College, Purdue University, Rutgers University, Southern Illinois University, State University of New York, University of Arizona, University of Colorado, University of Nevada, University of Oklahoma, University of Oregon, University of Rochester, University of Toledo, Washington State University, Wayne State University, Western Michigan University. CALIFORNIA PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1962-63: University of the Pacific, Mills College, Pomona College, University of Redlands and Occidental College.

generally comparable to the State Colleges, in that in general they meet the criteria of

(1) accreditation as four-year colleges by their regional accrediting associations,

(2) operation with basic scales governing faculty salaries,

(3) having enrollments ranging from 2,500 to 10,000 full-time equivalent students,

(4) having full-time paid teaching staffs as distinguished from the non-paid staffs of religious orders,

(5) offering programs generally similar to those of the State Colleges,

(6) requiring training and experience for faculty rank similar to those of the State Colleges, and

(7) being basically concerned with liberal arts and vocational programs of instruction rather than with research. The twelve schools selected in the sample include three state teachers colleges, one private college, three municipal colleges, and five state universities.[1]

The Council's 1963 Budget Report to the Legislature noted that eleven of these twelve institutions were still on lists used by the State Colleges. However, due to the great changes that had taken place in the State Colleges since the criteria were developed the report recognized that many of these criteria were no longer applicable and cited the need for a new list with the suggestion that one criterion might be to choose the institutions from which the State Colleges heavily recruit their faculty. Another suggestion was to use those out-of-state institutions from which newly appointed faculty receive their degrees. The report concluded that until a more carefully selected list of institutions for comparative purposes can be developed, nine state universities would be used for the purpose of establishing relationships and projections.[2]

The University continued to use its basic group of comparison institutions; (Yale, Columbia, Michigan, Harvard, Princeton) institutions with which the University then competed for faculty and with which it ranked academically. The University's citation of comparable academic ranking was supported by the Keniston report[3] published in 1958. The Keniston

---

[1]"Draft Report," May 17, 1957, Section III, p. 6.

[2]The nine universities were: Illinois, Indiana, Purdue, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, Ohio State, Michigan State, and Wisconsin.

[3]Hayward Keniston, Graduate Study and Research In the Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1958.

report developed a ranking of graduate schools and research in the arts and sciences. The report placed the University of California as the fourth-ranking graduate school in the United States; the five comparison institutions ranked number one, two, three, five and eight.[1]

In 1964 the Council reviewed procedures for the development of the report on faculty salaries and concluded that adherence to the principle of comparisons with appropriate institutions was the most valid single basis of arriving at salary levels. The University utilized the same five comparison institutions that had been used the previous year. A new list of comparison institutions for the State Colleges was developed which was based upon institutions having comparable or similar functions and programs. In order to derive an acceptable list, a classification system of the U. S. Office of Education was used. This system classifies all institutions of higher education by highest level of offering and by type of program. For example, the University, Big Ten Schools, and Ivy League Schools, are classified "IV-K." This classification denotes curriculum offerings in the liberal arts and generally with three or more professional schools and the Ph.D. or equivalent degree being offered in the major disciplines. The highest classification for any State College was "III-F." This classification denotes curriculum offerings in the liberal arts and general, terminal-occupational and teacher preparatory with the master's and/or second professional degree being offered in the major disciplines. Based upon these classifications and the following criteria a list of comparison institutions was derived.

1. Accreditation as a four-year college by their regional accrediting associations.

2. Operation with basic scales governing faculty salaries.

3. Having enrollments ranging up to 20,000 students.

4. Having full-time paid teaching staff as distinguished from non-paid staff who are members of religious orders.

5. Offering programs generally similar to those of the State Colleges.

6. Requiring training and experience for faculty rank similar to those of the State Colleges.

7. Being basically concerned with liberal arts, first-stage graduate degrees, and minor emphasis in granting the doctorate or equivalent degree and minor research responsibility for the faculty.

---

[1] The top 15 high-ranking graduate departments according to the Keniston Study were: 1. Harvard, 2. Yale, 3. Princeton, 4. California, 5. Columbia, 6. Cornell, 7. Chicago, 8. Michigan, 9. Johns Hopkins, 10. Illinois, 11. North Carolina, 12. Bryn Mawr, 13. Pennsylvania, 14. New York University, 15. Stanford.

It was agreed that the following institutions met the criteria and would therefore be employed for salary comparison purposes with the State Colleges: Brooklyn College, Bowling Green, Brandeis University, Oberlin College, Colorado State University, Dartmouth College, Occidental College, Pomona College, Wesleyan University and Carleton College.

A study conducted by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (Legislative Analyst) in 1964 found that the reporting of salaries and fringe benefits as it had been made previously to the Legislature was fragmentary and lacked necessary consistency, with the result that the Legislature's consideration of the salary requests for the institutions of higher learning had been made unnecessarily difficult. The Committee, pursuant to House Resolution No. 250, 1964 First Extraordinary Session, had prepared a report by the Legislative Analyst which set forth a reporting procedure and recommended that the Legislature and the Governor should receive each December 1 a report on faculty salaries and welfare benefits from the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, plus such supplementary information as the University of California and the California State Colleges desired to furnish independently. These recommendations were approved through adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51, 1965 General Session. The recommended method for reporting to the Legislature on faculty salaries and other benefits was a major step toward the establishment of a consistent basis upon which the Legislature received comprehensive information about faculty salaries, other benefits, and related subjects from year to year. The report outlined the basic data to be included in the faculty salary report in the following areas:

A. Faculty Data
B. Salary Data
C. Fringe Benefits
D. Total Compensation
E. Special Privileges and Benefits
F. Supplementary Income

The report noted that the University for several years had exchanged salary data to provide a consistent comparison not only with the group of five "eminent" universities, but with a group of nine public universities as well. The University recommendations, however, were based upon relationships to the five institutions only. The report recommended that a similar consistent list of comparison institutions for the State Colleges be developed. The 1966 Annual Report on Faculty Salaries, Benefits, and Recruitment prepared by the Council continued the basic principle of comparability for the University with five leading institutions (Columbia, Harvard Michigan, Yale and Princeton) with which it competes for faculty and has been ranked over the past two decades (Princeton replaced Chicago in 1960). Criteria were established to aid the selection of comparable institutions for the State Colleges. There were

1. Accreditation as a four-year college by the regional accrediting association.

2. Enrollments of at least 1,000 students.

3. Full-time paid teaching staff as distinguished from non-paid staff who are members of religious orders.

4. Preparation and experience for faculty rank similar to those of the State Colleges.

5. Overall programs generally similar to those of the State Colleges--institutions of quality basically concerned with liberal arts, master's degree graduate programs and minor emphasis in granting the doctorate or equivalent degree and limited research responsibility for the faculty.

Institutions selected in accordance with the above criteria and used by the Council for salary comparisons were Carleton College, Colorado State University, Occidental College, Pomona College, Purdue University, Rutgers University, Southern Illinois University and Wesleyan University.

Beginning with the 1967 Annual Report on Faculty Salaries, Fringe Benefits and Recruitment, the University of California not only maintained the same group of five institutions for comparison purposes but also added Cornell, Wisconsin and Illinois in order to provide comparisons of salaries of faculty in the schools of business administration, education, engineering and law.[1]

Carleton College, Colorado State University and Wesleyan University did not supply data for the report to the State Colleges. These institutions were replaced by Brandeis University, Iowa State University and the University of Oregon. The State Colleges stated that these three new institutions would "give better geographic coverage without changing too appreciably the general salary levels involved."

In order to provide a list of comparison institutions for the 1968 report that was appropriately balanced between private and public institutions, the Council staff recommended that the comparison list for the University be expanded from five to eight institutions. Use of this expanded list continued to recognize the desirability for the University to maintain its historic status among the great universities of the country and at the same time added three large state-supported institutions to the comparison group. The "comparison eight" for the University of California in the 1968 report were Cornell, Harvard, Illinois, Michigan, Stanford, SUNY-Buffalo, Wisconsin and Yale.

The State Colleges had often expressed their opinion that this list of comparison institutions does not adequately reflect the tremendous growth problems that confront the State Colleges. In an attempt to recognize the growth of the State Colleges and to discontinue functional or program comparisons, the criteria for selection of comparison institutions for the State Colleges were modified as follows:

---

[1]Salaries of University of California faculty in business administration were compared with those in Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, Illinois and Cornell; in education with Columbia, Michigan, Harvard, Illinois and Wisconsin; in engineering with Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, Princeton and Yale; and in law with Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, Yale and Illinois.

1. Accreditation as a four-year college by its regional accrediting association.

2. Full-time paid teaching staff, as distinguished from non-paid staff who are members of religious orders.

3. Preparation and experience of faculty similar to those of the State Colleges.

4. Availability of graduate programs.

5. Widley geographic distribution of the comparison institutions, since the State Colleges must compete in a national market. In particular, they should be institutions located in the west, midwest and east--excluding the south.

6. Inclusion of several institutions selected on the basis of rapid growth, i.e., those adding approximately 50 or more full-time faculty members per year.

7. Inclusion of public colleges and universities in a ratio approximately 2.5 times the number of private colleges and universities, thereby conforming to the approximate national ratio.

8. A minimum of 10 institutions.

The 18 institutions selected for salary comparison with the State Colleges for the 1968 report were: Bowling Green State University, Brandeis University, Brooklyn College, Brown University, University of Colorado, Iowa State University, University of Kentucky, University of Massachusetts, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, State University of New York (Albany), Northwestern University, University of Oregon, Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, Rutgers, Southern Illinois University and Wayne State University.

It becomes apparent that the first step in trying to improve the Council recommendations on faculty salaries and other benefits is to furnish the Legislature with comprehensive and consistent data which identify the nature and level of competitive benefits. Consistency of reporting is difficult to achieve when the list of comparable institutions continually changes. The following tables summarize the shifting and changing nature of the comparison groups throughout recorded years.

Table 1

COMPARISON INSTITUTIONS
for the
University of California

	Year			
	1920-59	1960-66	1967	1968-69
Chicago	X			
Columbia	X	X	X	
Harvard	X	X	X	X
Michigan	X	X	X	X
Yale	X	X	X	X
Princeton		X	X	
Illinois			X	X
Cornell			X	X
Wisconsin			X	X
Stanford				X
SUNY-Buffalo				X

Table 2

COMPARISON INSTITUTIONS
for the
California State Colleges

	Year						
	1940-61	1962	1963	1964-65	1966	1967	1968-69
Brooklyn College	X	X		X			X
New Jersey State Teachers	X						
Oberlin College	X	X		X			
Rutgers University	X	X			X	X	X
Southern Illinois University	X	X			X	X	X
Washington State College	X	X					
State University of New York	X	X					
University of Arizona	X	X					
University of Colorado	X	X					X
University of Connecticut	X						
University of Nevada	X	X					
University of Oklahoma	X	X					
University of Oregon	X	X				X	X
University of Toledo	X	X					
Wayne State University	X	X					X
Bowling Green State University		X		X		X	X
Clark University	)	X					
Iowa State University	11	X				X	X
Kent State University	of	X					
Purdue University	above	X	X		X	X	X
University of Pacific	15	X					
University of Redlands	)	X					
University of Rochester		X					
Washington State University		X					
Western Michigan University		X					
Mills College		X					
Pomona College		X		X	X	X	
Occidental College		X		X	X	X	
Illinois State University	)		X				
Indiana University	9		X				
Michigan State University	to		X				X
Ohio University	15		X				
Oregon State University	members		X				
University of Minnesota	of		X				X
Wisconsin State University	the		X				
University of Washington	group		X				
Brandeis University	)			X		X	X
Carleton College				X	X		
Colorado State University				X	X		
Dartmouth College				X			
Wesleyan University				X	X		
Brown University							X
University of Kentucky							X
University of Massachusetts							X
State Univ. of New York (Albany)							X
Northwestern University							X
Pennsylvania State University							X